REMARKS

Claims 1-40, 42 and 43 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 13, 22, 29, 34, 42, and 43 have been amended in this Response as shown on pages 2-8. Applicant's representative acknowledges with appreciation the courtesies extended during the Examiner Interview conducted on August 14, 2006; however, no agreement was reached during this teleconference. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-40 and 42-43 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-40 and 42-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen *et al.* ("Using navigation data to improve IR functions in the context of Web search", Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management; Atlanta, Georgia, USA, ACM Press - 2001) in view of Eitel (U.S. 7,043,521). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of at least the following. Hansen *et al.* and Eitel, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations as set forth in the subject claims.

> To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second there must be a reasonable expectation of success. ***Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.*** *See* MPEP §706.02(j).

The claimed subject matter relates to improving search engine results by tuning a general-purpose search engine based upon an entry point that provides a link employed to access the general-purpose search engine. To this end, amended independent claim 1 (and similarly amended independent claims 13, 22, 29, 34, 42, and 43) recites a component that ***identifies an entry point that includes a link utilized to access the general-purpose search engine***; and a

tuning component that ***filters search query results of the general-purpose search engine based on criteria associated with the entry point***. Hansen *et al.* and Eitel, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the above stated novel features of the subject claims.

More particularly, Hansen *et al.* fails to teach or suggest a component that identifies an entry point that includes a link utilized to access the general-purpose search engine as noted in the Office Action dated May 19, 2006 (*See* page 3). Moreover, Hansen *et al.* does not teach or suggest a tuning component that filters search query results of the general-purpose search engine *based on criteria associated with the entry point* as claimed. The Office Action dated May 19, 2006 contends that Hansen *et al.* discloses filtering search query results *based on criteria associated with the entry point* by equating the entry point to manually derived content hierarchies or labeled URLs. (*See* page 3). Applicant's representative respectfully disagrees with such contentions. Rather, Hansen *et al.* relates to extracting search-related navigation information from proxy logs, and a mixture model which uses the search-related navigation data to perform clustering of queries to improve the display of search engine results by placing the target URL high in the displayed list. Hansen *et al.* notes that "[a] search session is the collection of words a user submits to a search engine (also known as a 'query string') together with the URLs of the Web pages they visit in response to their request." (*See* page 135, column 2). Thus, Hansen *et al.* relates to logging a query and selected results associated with the query. A query or a selected result, however, is not an entry point that includes a link utilized to access the general-purpose search engine. The entry point can be a gateway, web page, application, URL, *etc.* utilized to arrive at the general-purpose search engine instead of search results yielded from effectuated searches and that are thereafter selected. Since Hansen *et al.* relates to considering selected search results obtained from a query rather than an entry point that includes a link utilized to access the general-purpose search engine, Hansen *et al.* fails to teach or suggest such claimed aspects.

Eitel fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Hansen *et al. vis a vis* the subject claims. More particularly, Eitel does not teach or suggest a component that identifies an *entry point that includes a link utilized to access the general-purpose search engine* or a tuning component that filters search query results of the general-purpose search engine *based on criteria associated with the entry point*. The Office Action asserts that Eitel discloses that an entry point is identified by noting that "a local website or computer is used to generate context

for a search to a search engine." (*See* page 4). Applicant's representative disagrees with such assertion. Eitel relates to utilizing a search agent to provide search results, where the search agent can be transmitted from a searcher's CPU to remote website(s). (*See* column 2, line 66 – column 3, line 5). The search agent can include search vectors, and the search vectors can include search terms, attributes and/or contexts. As noted, "[a]n attribute may be any feature of a search term which may be used to limit or further define the search term." (*See* column 3, lines 10-11). According to an example, if a search term is "plane tickets" then an attribute can be the number of plane tickets. (*See* column 3, lines 43-54). Further, "[a] context may also be an attribute of the search term, but which is defined as a physical or intellectual environment which imparts further meaning to a search term." (*See* column 3, lines 12-14). Thus, for instance, a searcher can input "I am in Hawaii for a convention" in response to a query from the searcher's CPU, which can be parsed to determine that the searcher's context pertains to Hawaii and a convention. (*See* column 3, line 62-67). Accordingly, Eitel can employ user provided inputs related to search terms, attributes, and contexts to return search results; however, Eitel fails to identify and/or filter search query results based upon an entry point that includes a link utilized to access a general-purpose search engine. In contrast, the subject claims relate to determining and/or utilizing information related to the navigation to the general-purpose search engine *via* the entry point. Hence, Eitel fails to teach or suggest such claimed aspects.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Hansen *et al.* and Eitel, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the subject invention as recited in independent claims 1, 13, 22, 29, 34, 42, and 43 (and claims respectively depending therefrom). Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP444US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731